REMARKS

Claims 38-57 are pending. Claims 12, 15-26, 29-35, and 37 were previously pending. Applicant has canceled claims 12, 15-26, 29-35, and 37 and added claims 38-57.

The Examiner has rejected claims 12, 15-26, 29-35, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brotman and MCAllister. Although applicant has canceled the rejected claims, applicant would like to make the follow observations about the newly added claims.

Brotman describes a technique for inputting a string of characters in which the user first enters a key sequence and then speaks the characters of the key sequence. (Brotman, Fig. 2, 620.) For example, Brotman's user may enter the key sequence 4, 7, 2, 6, and 8, which corresponds to the characters {G, H, I}, {P, R, S}, {A, B, C}, {M, N, O}, and {T, U, V}. Brotman's user then speaks the intended characters of the string. (Brotman, Fig. 2, 650.) For example, the user may speak G, R, A, N, and D. In this case, Brotman determines there is a disagreement between 47268 and GRAND. The disagreement may have been a result of the user entering an 8 rather than a 3 as the last key. (Brotman, 5:1-7.) Brotman could automatically assume the user meant GRAND or GRANT or ask the user to confirm the intended string. (Brotman, Fig. 2, 670-730.) Thus, Brotman's user both inputs the key sequence and speaks the intended characters. If there is a disagreement between them, Brotman resolves the disagreement.

Applicant's technique is different from Brotman in that applicant's technique does not require the user to enter a key sequence and then to speak each character in sequence. Rather, applicant's technique inputs a key sequence and then outputs utterances corresponding to the keywords that match the key sequence and prompts the user to select the correct keyword. For example, the user may input the same key sequence of 4, 7, 2, 6, and 8 as discussed above. In such a case, applicant's technique might have a list of keywords for the key sequence that includes the words GRANT and

iRANT. Applicant's technique then outputs the utterances for GRANT and iRANT and prompts the user to select the correct utterance. For example, the user may repeat the correct utterance or select 1 or 2 corresponding to one of the utterances by speaking the number or using the keypad. If the user selects 1 from the keypad, then the input is GRANT.

Applicant's claims recite "identify[ing] from the received key sequence without other input from the user those keywords of the list whose initial characters match the possible characters of the received key sequence." (emphasis added.) Brotman identifies words based on both a key sequence and a spoken sequence. Brotman does not identify the possible keywords from the key sequence "without other input from the user."

In addition, the claims recite "providing a list of keywords of characters." Brotman has no such list. As a result, Brotman neither teaches nor suggests "identify[ing]... those keywords of the list whose initial characters match the possible characters of the received key sequence" as recited by the claims.

Based upon these remarks, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and its early allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8548.

Dated: September 14, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Maurice J. Pirio
Registration No.: 33,273
PERKINS COIE LLP
P.O. Box 1247
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247
(206) 359-8548
(206) 359-7198 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant